Stack
X STAC
500
2104

THE CASE AGAINST THE "MIXED" JEWISH AGENCY

by

MEER GROSSMAN

PRICE THREEPENCE.

Published by
The Union of Zionists Revisionists.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

Annex
00 ENC
500
2104

THE OBJECT.

The scheme for extending the Jewish Agency, provided for in the Palestine Mandate, and now vested in the Zionist Organisation, has been hotly debated at several Congresses and in the Press for the past six years and more. And still Zionists as a body do not appear to have realised the grave consequences which it must have upon the future of the Zionist Movement and the work of colonising Palestine. People continue to talk of the advent of the "mixed Agency" as of something innocuous or even desirable, rejoicing, in their simplicity, in the prospect of co-operation between differing groups in Jewry. They seem to overlook entirely the political implications of so fateful a step.

It is only when we leave behind us the broad path of generalities and face hard facts that we begin to see the whole preposterousness of the scheme. It is true that gradually various sections of the Zionist Movement are coming round to realise that if the plan is carried into effect it will lead to the disintegration of the Zionist Organisation and the abdication of its supreme body—the Congress, but they lack the courage to act in order to put a stop to this suicidal policy. Some think it is too late now, and that there really is no other way of building up the country; others, though deploring the subordination, yet believe that they will somehow be able to manage their diffident partners. There seem to be some very contradictory and misleading ideas abroad among Zionists concerning the status and the rights of the Agency. People simply do not know all the circumstances and the conditions of the coming change.

To examine the facts, to call attention to the dangers of a "mixed body," and generally to state the case of those who oppose the present Agency Scheme and are determined to continue their fight against it—this is the purpose of this little book.

5002104

WHAT IS THE JEWISH AGENCY ?

The establishment of an appropriate body was necessary in order to provide a legal channel for permanent contact and co-operation between the Mandatory Power and the Jewish people. The Zionist Organisation was the only organised Jewish public body with world-wide ramifications which presented the claim for reinstatement of the Jewish people in Palestine, and possessed adequate machinery for carrying out this work.

The Mandate for Palestine, therefore, provides that :

> **An appropriate Jewish Agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may effect the establishment of the Jewish National Home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.**
>
> **The Zionist Organisation, so long as its organisation and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency. It shall take steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government, to secure the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish National Home.**

Another article of the Mandate—the eleventh—defines the relations between the Administration of Palestine and the Jewish Agency, as follows :

> **The Administration may arrange with the Jewish Agency mentioned in Article 4 to construct or operate, upon fair and equitable terms, any public works, services and utilities, and to develop any of the natural resources of the country, in so far as these matters are not directly undertaken by the Administration.**

The Jewish Agency is thus seen to be the only recognised legal channel of communication of the Jewish people with the British Government and the League of Nations.

Naturally, everything depends on the manner in which the advising of the Mandatory Power and the co-operation with it is carried out. As long as the Agency—the Zionist Executive—was controlled exclusively by Congress, its policy was in the hands of the Zionist electorate, which in the last recourse had power to change any Zionist Administration which may have failed in its efforts to protect the rights of the Jewish people.

ATTEMPTS TO BROADEN THE BASE.

Zionists have always realised that it would be desirable —and they have made several attempts in this direction— to broaden the base of Zionism and to draw other elements of Jewry into the work of upbuilding Palestine. So far, all these attempts have failed, because of the deep cleavage between the political aspirations of Zionism and the antagonistic or neutral attitude of the other groups in Jewry— groups which are fundamentally opposed to Jewish Nationalism.

Before the Balfour Declaration was issued, and after, plans were considered to transfer the Jewish rights under the proposed Mandate to a general Jewish body, which would accept Palestine on behalf of the Jewish people. Influential sections of Jewry, however, declined to acknowledge this consolidation towards a reunited Jewish people. Also the British Government did not care to transfer political functions to a body of obscure origin and transient composition.

The formation of the Keren Hayesod was another attempt in the same direction. Its initiators believed that this Fund would serve as the instrument of all Jewry, irrespective of party, and fifty per cent of the seats on its board were from the outset reserved for non-Zionist contributors. The results are well known. A frame was created, but it has remained empty; a door was opened, but nobody wanted to enter. Not a single conference of

Keren Hayesod contributors has been held. Jews gave money, but left the rest to the Zionists. Only a few non-Zionists have been harnessed in for the work, but they have never asked for control.

So the Keren Hayesod, instead of being non-partisan, has simply become another Zionist fund, with a purely Zionist board controlled by the Zionist Congress. Those who believed the pioneer task of the Zionist Organisation already accomplished, and expected to transfer to "neutrals" the burden of rebuilding a nation in a devastated country, have had to admit that they were grievously mistaken.

The third attempt to broaden the base was the decision to call a Jewish World Congress. It failed for the same reasons, and also because the Zionist leaders came too late with their scheme. Popular enthusiasm had already begun to wane. And the plan was postponed.

Then, in 1923, Jewish Palestine experienced its first severe crisis: inadequate funds, emigration, the White Paper, an unfriendly administration. Instead of trying to discover the source of the trouble, and to take appropriate and bold action within and without, the Zionist leaders ascribed everything to lack of funds and lack of response; they went in the direction of least resistance. Frightened, pessimistic, they looked for salvation to the old "boss" of Jewish communal life—the notable, the *Gvir*. It was certainly the easiest way out: let the rich Jews help us! At any price and subject to every concession! America had money, and though American Jewry was led by rich Capitalists, protagonists of assimilation, anti-Zionists, it did not matter. They were against Diaspora Nationalism? Drop it! They did not recognise the priority of Palestine? Drop it! They disliked election to and control by a democratic Congress? Drop it! Surrender, for respite! Such was the policy of Dr. Weizmann, the opportunist statesman.

Then endless negotiation, postponement, investigation!

So, in a time of despair and resignation, the extended Jewish Agency Scheme was born.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF A MIXED AGENCY.

Not voluntarily, but under the pressure of constant threatening on the part of the leaders, the Zionist Congress finally consented to conclude an agreement with the non-Zionists, and " for the sake of Palestine," to transfer its sovereign rights to the control of people who admittedly saw no difference between the colonisation of Palestine or of the Crimea. The Zionists decided to make grave changes in the composition of the Jewish Agency, by enlarging it through the inclusion of fifty per cent non-Zionists, most of whom would be appointees. It meant placing limitations on Zionist work, since non-Zionists, or even anti-Zionists, were to be given a share in the working of the Agency provided for in the Mandate.

Put briefly, the extension of the Agency implies the following fundamental changes in the constitution of the Zionist Organisation and the composition of the Agency:

(1) The functions of the Jewish Agency under international law, as set forth in the first paragraph of Article 4 of the Mandate will be exercised in future by the extended Jewish Agency, which will represent Jewish interests in connection with the upbuilding of the National Home before the Palestine Government and the Mandatory Power.

(2) The " Council " will be the supreme organ of the extended Agency. It will lay down the lines of policy and direct the work of the other organs of the Agency. There will also be a Standing Committee and Executive.

(3) All directing organs of the Agency will be composed of Zionists and non-Zionists in equal numbers.

(4) The non-Zionist representatives of various countries will be appointed in agreement with the leaders of Jewry in all countries except the United States of America,

preferably by democratic methods, but adapted to the particular local conditions.

(5) Forty per cent of the seats allocated to non-Zionists will be filled by nominations by a Committee of seven appointed by Mr. Marshall.

(6) The Keren Hayesod will become the principal financial instrument of the extended Agency, at whose disposal its entire receipts will be placed.

WAS THERE ANY OBLIGATION TO ENLARGE THE AGENCY ?

To support the shaky scheme, rumours were circulated intimating that the fatal step was not only unavoidable for financial reasons, but that it was being adopted in compliance with the provisions of the Mandate. It must, therefore, be stated here as definitely as possible that:—

Firstly:— There is no obligation whatever on the part of the Zionist Organisation to enlarge the Jewish Agency by admitting any other body. The ways and means of " securing the co-operation of all Jews " are left entirely to the Zionist Organisation. The manner and form of co-operation are not determined in any way by the Mandate.

Secondly:— There has never been a request or even an intimation from the British Government that the Agency should be enlarged either by the establishment of a new mixed body, or by any other method. Dr. Weizmann had to confirm this fact publicly at the session of the Actions Committee held in Berlin last December.

Thirdly:— There is nothing to show that in the opinion of the Mandatory, the Zionist Organisation is no longer the " appropriate " Agency.

Fourthly:— Non-Zionists who were really interested in the fate of Palestine never suggested to the Zionist Organisation that they would not assist in the upbuilding

of Palestine unless they would share the political prerogatives of the Zionist Executive. Non-Zionists were not at all so anxious to be mixed up with a Nationalist Movement. *Millions* of non-Zionist money were poured into Palestine without any demand, ultimatum, or agreement.

The whole abortive scheme was of Zionist creation, a naive attempt to " rope in " antagonists by offering them control, a production of primitive Pinsk statesmanship. Dissatisfied, disgruntled, powerless, disbelieving and defeatist leaders have made *a clumsy attempt to hide failure behind a new signboard.*

CO-OPERATION, BUT NOT AMALGAMATION.

It must further be made quite clear that the Zionist Opposition, and in particular the Revisionists who are against *such* an extension of the Agency have never entertained the ridiculous idea ascribed to them, that they do not desire the co-operation of non-Zionists in the upbuilding of Palestine. On every occasion they have declared—sincerely and freely—that they are more than anxious to invite the assistance and support of every Jew who is interested, from whatever angle, in the upbuilding of Palestine as a Jewish National Home. " We are prepared to welcome the closest co-operation in the economic field with all those elements who take a real part in the upbuilding of Palestine," says a Revisionist manifesto issued as far back as 1925. " But, the political ideals of Zionism can be defended only by those who believe in them—only by Zionists."

Co-operation does not mean amalgamation, or the giving up of one's most sacred principles, nor the surrender of the only legal instrument a political movement has at its disposal. Why should co-operation, to which the Mandate refers, and for which we were hoping, bring about the abolition of the traditional character of the Movement and the Sovereignty of the Congress? The problem is

not *whether* we should draw in people, but *how*?

The friends we could gain, we have secured without the extension of the Agency, without agreements, demands or counter-proposals. Work in Palestine is not the monopoly of Zionists. Anyone who wishes to help, for whatever reason, can go to Palestine and do useful work without being questioned whether he desires the establishment of a Jewish State or not. Moreover, everyone is entitled to the political protection of the Zionist Organisation. But why shake the foundations of a democratic movement?

There are many instances of fruitful non-Zionist work in Palestine and friendly co-operation between Zionist and non-Zionist: the Rutenberg concession, the Palestine Economic Board, the Nesher Cement Factory, the Palestine Economic Corporation, and many other enterprises. Are the Earl of Reading, Sir Hugo Hirst, and Mr. Bernhard Baron Zionists? Did they ask for the enlargement of the Agency? Was not the Palestine Economic Corporation, with $2,300,000 invested in Palestine, established with "mixed" money? Non-Zionists want business methods, sensible investments, order in Palestine and nothing else. If they had political aspirations, they would have joined the Zionist Organisation.

These and many other Palestinian undertakings have achieved important results without the mixed Jewish Agency, and if Dr. Weizmann and his colleagues had devoted as much time to concrete practical propositions in Palestine as to the Agency Scheme, our position would be much stronger now, both inwardly and without.

Only recently, Liberal Jews in England and Germany, while turning down the invitations to join the Agency, have declared that they would gladly co-operate in any effort to help Jews in other countries, including Palestine, but they do not want to commit themselves to a political movement. **It is, therefore, a fallacy to assert that the only way of obtaining non-Zionist assistance for Palestine is by surrendering the Congress.**

ZIONISTS AND NON-ZIONISTS.

We oppose the mixed Agency, not because we are afraid of the non-Zionists, distrust them, or doubt their sincerity. Not at all. They have been frank enough to say that they are neither Zionists nor Nationalists, nor do they want a Jewish State. But the wide difference of opinion on fundamental principles concerning the present and future of the Jewish people makes an alliance in this form undesirable and futile.

Wherein lies the differentiation?

A Zionist is first and foremost a Jewish Nationalist, recognising and adhering to a Jewish Nation, physically dispersed, but united in aim. *A non-Zionist* is a Jew by religion and tradition; his association with Jewry lies mainly in the past. He regards the Jews as a religious community whose adherents belong to various peoples.

A Zionist strives for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. He sees the territorial concentration of Jewry as the only answer to the Jewish problem; his is an individual urge to escape from the *Galuth*. *A non-Zionist* accepts the Diaspora for ever; he tries to solve the Jewish question on the spot by adapting himself to his surroundings. If he is interested in Palestine, it is as in a home for those who live there or may go there.

A Zionist endeavours to obtain a Jewish majority in Palestine; his objective is political—consequently he employs appropriate measures, and primarily those of a political nature. Palestine is the goal of his activity. The *non-Zionist* is ready to assist needy Jews everywhere, Palestine not excluded. Methods of mass colonisation are obviously outside his scope. He approaches the problem philanthropically and not nationally.

A Zionist believes in Jewish political action, and in political tactics. A *non-Zionist* repudiates the idea of separate Jewish political activity, because he considers it

dangerous to his citizen rights. Nationally he is not a Jew, and Jewish interests are secondary to him.

A Zionist aims at the national revival of the Jewish people everywhere; he desires to express himself fully and live his own life even in the Diaspora. The *non-Zionist* disclaims Diaspora Nationalism and declines Jewish political activity of any kind.

A Zionist aspires to the cultural renaissance of Jewry: Hebrew language, Jewish literature, theatre, music, sports. He creates Jewish values. The cultural form of Palestine is to him a matter of primary importance. The *non-Zionist* is interested partly in the Synagogue, partly in charity, partly in combating anti-Semitism. These are his limitations.

Here are essential fundamental differences of opinion and outlook. Deep waters separate Zionists from non-Zionists. How can they meet and work together harmoniously for a cause which cries out for political action?

HOW SOME NON-ZIONISTS SEE THE SCHEME.

Here are a few of the latest outspoken opinions of non-Zionists on Palestine, Zionist aspirations and the task of the Mixed Agency:—

"It (Palestine) is to be a home for Palestinians of the Jewish religion," the *Jewish Guardian* writes in welcoming the advent of the mixed Agency.

"In our opinion," says the *American Hebrew,* "a non-Zionist eligible to a place on the Council of the Agency is he who has been opposed to the nationalistic and political platform of the Zionist Organisation, but has nevertheless evinced an interest in the economic and cultural rehabilitation of the Holy Land."

"The formula about a Jewish National Home in Palestine remains, but it is only a formula. Though the non-Zionist does not like the formula, he will not quarrel over

a shadow," comments the *Jewish Religious Bulletin,* the organ of Liberal Judaism.

"The land of Palestine can hold no special place in the future constitution of the Jews" the Federation of Liberal Jews in Germany affirms.

"An impression is being spread as if the German Jews do not belong to the German nation, but that they belong to a Jewish nation, which is scattered all over the world and has its home in Palestine," the Central Union of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith declares. "This state of affairs," it proceeds, "is jeopardising that which has been won in over a hundred years of fighting for emancipation. The Central Union of German Jews must therefore oppose more effectively than hitherto the Zionist conception, according to which Judaism is presented as a national and cultural community of all Jews, with Palestine as their national and cultural centre."

WILL THE EXTENDED AGENCY LEAD TO UNITY?

One of the contentions of the Agency protagonists is that the enlargement of the Jewish Agency, by including fifty percent non-Zionists, will lead to unity in Jewry. They pen sentimental pictures of *Achduth,* unification of all forces, peace in Israel. Alas, unpleasant facts such as agreements and constitution reveals an entirely different aspect. The fifty-fifty system achieves just the opposite effect. Furthermore: it is dangerous because **it sanctions for ever the division of the Jewish people into Zionists and non-Zionists**, thus demonstrating the cleavage before the world; it establishes perpetually that at least half the Jews are not in agreement with Zionist aspirations.

The new body will not be homogeneous. There will always be two parties—each concerned to uphold its own rights and privileges. All the negotiations in connection with the Agency were conducted on the basis of securing and maintaining *the balance of power.*

How can anyone talk of unity, when the very basis of the scheme is against a spiritual unification of the two elements? No, it is a divided unity, an obstacle to future development and gradual understanding.

If there is mutual trust and complete understanding, why so many conditions, provisions, safeguards and reservations on both sides? Why should the Marshall group insist on calling itself non-Zionist, a purely negative classification?

AN UNWORKABLE SCHEME.

Even before the first draft of the Constitution for the enlarged Agency was ready, it was clear that the arrangement was unsound and unworkable from the organisational point of view. But the published constitution makes it a certainty beyond all doubt.

The division of the General Council and the Executive bodies into two solid blocks of members, which have to vote separately, makes the work obviously difficult. It provides the groundwork for an everlasting struggle for predominance, and perpetuates a system of two opposing groups of equal balance which may lead to sabotage and threats of ultimatums. Under such conditions, each time a block of members disagrees with a certain point, it votes solidly against it and automatically nullifies the proposition of the other side. We once had in Ukraine a Jewish National Council, constructed on the fifty-fifty principle, and the result was that not one fundamental problem was ever decided.

The constitution drafted by the Zionist Executive provides that the membership of the Council at any given time shall be equally divided. The Executive of the Agency, too, will not be elected by the general body at its joint meetings, but the Zionist half will be elected by Zionists, and the non-Zionist half by non-Zionists. Even the salaries of the members of the Executive will be covered

in the case of the Zionist members by the Zionist Organisation, and in the case of the non-Zionist members by the non-Zionists.

How a body composed in such a manner can work is beyond human comprehension.

THE EFFECT ON THE ZIONIST ORGANISATION.

It is an easy matter now to foretell the effect of the extension of the Jewish Agency upon the Zionist Organisation. It is clear that the Organisation and its executive bodies must become redundant, since there will be very little room left for their activities. At first Zionists may perhaps feel relieved of a burden and turn to educational propaganda, but gradually they will begin to realise that there is no need to maintain a Zionist Organisation when its main work is being done by other institutions? Who wants a useless body?

Mixed institutions—a General Council, a Standing Committee, an Executive of its own—are to be established by the extended Jewish Agency (always subject to the fifty-fifty principle), *alongside* the existing similar Zionist bodies—the Congress, Actions Committee, and Executive. But the power to control and decide and to negotiate with the Government will belong to the Agency; the Zionist bodies will function to all practical purposes only in an advisory capacity. This is to empty them of all content and condemn them to a lingering but sure end.

Such a state of affairs must inevitably kill the movement. Why should one wish to join a Zionist Organisation? Why should one undertake obligations, when one has so little to say in the matter? Besides, one can do one's duty to Palestine without assuming the moral obligations of a Zionist, without being a Jewish Nationalist and framing one's whole life accordingly.

The National aspect of the Zionist movement, with

all its creative values, is bound to disappear. The spirit of compromise will reign everywhere. Without the glow of a democratic movement, without a political perspective, without the right of control and direct contact with affairs —what will become of the Zionist Organisation? There will be little room left for the activity of those very elements which for thirty years were the backbone of Zionism. For they will have nothing to offer the youth, nothing with which to inspire them.

THE SURRENDER OF THE CONGRESS.

What importance and prestige—without and within—can a Congress have which is deprived of its legislative rights, and has power neither to control political action nor to check expenditure? In the best of circumstances it is *reduced to a rehearsal* for the session of the Agency Council, a caucus of a party sending delegates to a supreme body.

The Agency Scheme undermines the very foundation of a democratically elected representative body—it **renounces the basic principle of a People's movement, the power to elect its own leaders.** The sovereignty of the Congress will to all practical purposes be abandoned. It is true that the Congress will have its deliberations for the purpose of receiving the report of its delegates on the Agency Council, and perhaps of recalling them, but is this the function of Herzl's grand creation?

And it is not only the practical side of the business which repels—the very idea of a mixed Agency where fifty per cent popularly *elected* members are to have exactly the same rights as fifty per cent *appointed* notables is obnoxious and degrading.

We were proud of our Zionist Congress—perhaps the greatest of all Jewish achievements—a symbol of National revival, a world tribune, a unique Parliament whose working was interwoven with the life of the smallest Jewish

village and the humblest Jew. It gave the dispossessed and persecuted Jew a sense of citizenship and responsibility. Once every two years an assembly came together—*his assembly*—where his voice was heard and his approval was sought. Can the value of such an institution be estimated?

Now the Congress is to be reduced to impotence, to the degrading role of an appendix. Who will care a fig about it? Its place will be taken by a sham democracy. And the shame and degradation of it! We shall elect delegates, conducting campaigns, canvassing voters, to have the Congress meet..... in order to elect exactly as many members of the Agency as will be comfortably appointed by Mr. Marshall's Committee of seven, who will "name and designate the non-Zionist members of the Jewish Agency allotted to the U.S.A."

What a farce!

ORGANISING NON-ZIONISTS.

The essence of the fifty-fifty agreement is the maintenance of the balance of power between Zionists and non-Zionists. Not only in the General Council, but in the Standing Committee and Executive, the fifty-fifty principle must be observed, with the result that **it is bound ultimately to lead to the creation of a permanent non-Zionistic organisation on a world scale.** Zionists doing their utmost to consolidate non-Zionist opinion!—can anyone imagine a greater piece of folly than this?

The Weizmann-Marshall agreement projects the formation of "an organisation, voluntary or incorporated, to represent non-Zionists" on the Agency Council. The headquarters of such an organisation are already established in New York, since the same Marshall group "shall be consulted with respect to non-Zionists on the General Council and the Executive Committee for countries other than the United States, and that *such allotment shall be approved by the (American) Organisation Committee.*"

The Zionists hope to present a united front on the Agency Council, and in the nature of things it must make for the other, the non-Zionist fifty acting as a united body and consolidating their forces.

Zionist Organisations throughout the world are engaged now in picking up here and there distinguished gentlemen, preferably men of wealth, whose chief qualifications must be that they are non-Zionists. They will be appointed as members of the Agency (practically by us), brought together, given a chief in the person of Mr. Marshall, allocated fifty per cent of Congress Sovereignty—and here you are: **with our own hands we are organising opponents to be masqueraded as non-Zionist Jewry.**

A democratic movement to organise its own opponents —was there ever such a spectacle?!

MANAGEMENT BY PROXY.

Nobody doubts that the Marshall Group mean business. Men of affairs, they dislike mass movements, debates and discussions. Nor are they prepared to leave events to chance. Zionists who had secretly nursed the hope that they would be able to secure the great names and the big purses of the notables, while themselves ruling safely, because the others would be too busy to attend meetings and conferences, were unfortunately in grave error.

The Americans are very shrewd ; their mentality and their methods may be judged by their proposal to introduce the "proxy system" into the management of the affairs of the Agency. Not wishing to run the risk of being outvoted, and desirous *at all times* to be sure of their fifty per cent non-Zionist votes, they included in their agreement with Dr. Weizmann the following clause:—

> **"That members of the Council and of the Executive Committee of the Jewish Agency shall at all times be entitled to vote by proxy."**

In ordinary language, this means that one or several non-Zionist members of the Agency will be entitled to vote on behalf of their absent colleagues. One can visualise a meeting of the General Council of the Agency, with one side of the assembly hall occupied by Zionists, all present in their factions and groups, and on the other side, several gentlemen who, after listening calmly to the heated discussions, will coolly rise and declare: "we represent the other, the non-Zionist fifty per cent by proxy."

The humiliating character of this suggestion was too much for even the Actions Committee, and it objected to the creation of such a device. It is, however, characteristic of the state of mind of the Zionist leaders that they had signed in New York an agreement which included this clause.

ENDANGERING THE MANDATE.

The opposition to the Agency Scheme has been constantly warning Zionists that the scheme endangers the status secured to the Zionist Organisation under Article 4 of the Mandate. That even Congress was concerned about this danger is shown by a resolution of the political Committee of the last Congress, asking that before any official notification is made to the British Government and the League of Nations, expert opinion be obtained with regard to the effect the change in the composition of the Agency may have on the Mandate. For the same reason, the fourteenth Zionist Congress decided to include in the Constitution of the enlarged Agency a provision that the agreement with the non-Zionists shall be in force for a period of three years only, at the conclusion of which period the question of its renewal should be reconsidered.

It is the general consensus of opinion now that any change in the text of the Mandate will have grave consequences for the Zionist cause, not only because it will affect the status of the Zionist Organisation under Article

4, but because it may carry with it serious implications in the event of the dissolution of the enlarged Agency.

It is obvious that, to safeguard the integrity of Zionist aims and ideas and rights under the Mandate, the Mandate must under no circumstances be changed. **A change in the text of the Mandate would be tantamount to the surrender of the Zionist rights secured after years of effort.**

The Zionist Executive have had to admit now that, from the legal point of view, the enlargement of the Agency is not so harmless a step as it had hitherto seemed to many Zionists.

"It will be necessary," says the Executive, in the memorandum submitted to the Actions Committee, "for the Mandatory Power to be formally notified of the reconstitution and enlargement of the Agency, and requested to recognise the enlarged Agency as the body discharging the functions of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, as defined in Article 4 of the Mandate."

So it is no longer a disputable assertion of the opposition, but a fact, that the Zionist Organisation is *de facto*, if not *de jure*, to withdraw as the Agency, and to be replaced by another body.

Realising the difficulty, the Actions Committee decided that it will be further necessary to obtain from the Mandatory Power a satisfactory assurance with regard to the status of the Zionist Organisation under Article 4 of the Palestine Mandate, in the event of the dissolution of the enlarged Agency. There is some doubt whether such an assurance will be given by the British Government. One thing, however, is certain—that **we ourselves will be making the first move to undermine the legal basis of the present Agency,** for, once the composition of the present Agency is changed, it will be a very difficult task afterwards to safeguard the integrity of Zionist rights.

An extended Agency is not contemplated by the Mandate, and the withdrawal of the Zionist Organisation is

a dangerous adventure from a legal point of view. Experts assail the scheme also from another point of view: they deny to the Zionist Organisation the right to give up its position as Agency and constitute a new Agency on lines devised by itself, without actually changing the provisions of the Mandate.

RELATIONS WITH THE MANDATORY POWER.

Instead of improving and strengthening our relations with Great Britain, there is every likelihood that the enlarged Jewish Agency will aggravate them. Moreover, a **"mixed body" is apt to endanger the very foundation of our agreement with the Mandatory Power.** Hitherto England has dealt with *Jewish Nationalists,* for whom Jewish National interests are in the foreground, but in the future it will be confronted by people the majority of whom are in the first instance American, German, French, etc.

When Great Britain entered into a pact with the Zionists—and we view the Mandate as a pact based on mutual political interests—it relied on Jewish sympathy and support in exchange for a fair interpretation of the Mandate. It was a transaction between one nation and another. Zionism was thereby acknowledged as a political force of international value. Zionists may quarrel with one or another administration, protest, be dissatisfied, but the basis—mutual trust and mutual interests—remains unchanged because the Zionist Executive, as the Jewish Agency, represents Jewish interests only.

The new Agency Scheme alters entirely the composition of that public body; its base and the source of its authority will undergo a change. Fifty per cent of its members, while agreeing to co-operate in the upbuilding of Palestine, do not withdraw their opposition to the main principle of Zionism—that the Jews are a nation and have political interests of their own.

Here is one instance: Jewish Nationalists may reasonably not hesitate to welcome the Seventh Dominion scheme,

seeing in it a practical expression of the Anglo-Jewish partnership idea, with regard to Palestine, but the non-Zionist fifty per cent—who knows what circumstances and obscure influences may determine their attitude to such a scheme?

WHERE IS THE IMMEDIATE RELIEF ?

All who know the facts will recall that Dr. Weizmann's plan was not accepted with any elation by the movement at large. The Agency extension was agreed to only after a very hard struggle, and under the pressure of a crisis in Palestine. Moreover, it was accepted under duress and threat of resignation by the Zionist Executive, at a moment when Congress was not in session.

One of the most effective arguments in favour of the Agency was that this was a case of *immediate relief,* and that the inclusion of non-Zionists meant real prosperity for Palestine. The formula was so simple:— *the work in Palestine is in danger of collapsing; Palestine needs money — it must be got at once from the non-Zionists who are waiting to step in.* Psychologically, a considerable part was played also by the unexpressed wish to transfer the responsibility to other shoulders. The so-called practical people were not unwilling to surrender their sovereignty, because they expected a cash consideration in exchange.

Now, though the Agency idea was conceived as the only means of securing immediate relief, what actual help have Palestine and the Zionist Organisation received from the other side during the past five years? Where is the much heralded support and material assistance? Were the new lovers of Zion waiting for the signing of the contract, while Palestine suffered? And where have they been during the years of severest crisis, and where are they now that the historic New York conferences have been held?

The Zionist Organisation is still alone in shouldering the entire burden.

Only the other day, Professor Mordecai M. Kaplan complained in the New-York *" New Palestine "*:—

> "The transition from the campaigns single-handedly managed by the Zionist Organisation to united Agency campaigns, must of course be a gradual and smooth one; the transition cannot be effected overnight. All the more reason, therefore, why the elaborate machinery which a united Agency campaign will require should begin to be organised now. That is why the Zionists have sound reason to be apprehensive about the persistent silence of most of those who at the conference last November testified their willingness and readiness to participate in enlarged work for Palestine. This silence was unnecessarily noticeable at the convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations held the other day in San Francisco, at which some of the most articulate participants in last November's conference were present."

There are in evidence, so far, then, neither money, new constructive ideas, nor the enthusiasm of a united Jewry. **The argument of immediate relief must consequently be withdrawn.**

SURRENDERING STRATEGIC POSITIONS.

Every Zionist should remember:

(1) That the Jewish Agency is the only important political instrument still left in the hands of the Zionist Organisation;

(2) That it is the only legal channel for communication with the British Government and the League of Nations;

(3) That, not the Zionist Executive, but the mixed body will in future negotiate with the British Government, formulating and presenting Zionist demands.

(4) That the views of the Yishub and the Zionist

diaspora, their demands and complaints, will be subject to the control of the new body.

And all these important strategic positions, linking us with the outside world, Zionist leaders are now prepared to hand over to people who state openly and straightforwardly that they are neither Zionists nor Jewish Nationalists.

NOT AN ACCOMPLISHED FACT.

It is premature to assert, as some do, that the extended Agency is already an accomplished fact, and that there is no going back. *The Agency is decidedly not yet in a state of consummation.* It is far from being a reality; it is still a preliminary pact. There is still time, therefore, either to withdraw entirely from the project, or to change thoroughly this scheme, conceived in a desperate mood by tired leaders, devoid of enthusiasm.

The Opposition does not doubt the good faith of the leaders, and does not accuse them of a conscious desire to surrender the principles of Zionism. Dr. Weizmann and his associates may believe sincerely that this is the only way left to build Palestine. **But we see other ways and means, without impairing the Mandate and the Congress.** For we still believe in the potential creative power of the Jewish masses. These masses brought about the remarkable success of the Zionist Movement ; they raised enormous funds and organised banks, factories, colonies; they rehabilitated the name of the Jewish people; they did it all, not only without the aid, but against the wish, of those who are called non-Zionists and are now invited to conduct and supervise the realisation of Zionism. Why then should we doubt that the Jewish people, if properly led, will still be able to bring the Zionist venture to a successful conclusion, without any of these hazardous schemes?

OUR FIGHT AND OUR PLAN.

The Revisionists are out to fight this scheme and to prevent the surrender of everything that is National and Democratic in our Movement. They still hope to influence the coming Congress to assert its will to exist, and perform an historic function in Jewry.

Our opposition is not destructive; *we are prepared to welcome in the economic field the closest co-operation with every Jew. The political aims of Zionism, however, must be as hitherto, defended by a Zionist Executive responsible to a democratically elected Congress.*

There are at least three different ways of achieving an effective co-operation with non-Zionists or neutral sections of Jewry, without in the least endangering the Mandate and the Sovereignty of the Congress:

To convoke a World Congress for the upbuilding of Palestine, consisting of delegates elected by Jewish communities throughout the world: this may take some time to achieve, but such a Congress will have authority and a firm foundation based on a popular electorate ;

or

To broaden the present base of the Zionist Organisation by granting the franchise to everyone who is helping in the reconstruction of *Eretz Israel*: all inhabitants of Palestine, all contributors to Zionist funds, all shareholders in our banks, all members of Jewish associations participating in the Palestine work, should have the right to participate in the Congress elections;

or

To establish a Joint Supreme Economic Council to promote and supervise the constructive economic work in Palestine. All institutions, Palestinian companies, societies, Labour Unions, and Chambers of Commerce, of every category, should participate in this body. This would be a

representative gathering of men and women doing practical work in Palestine, and interested, not in generalities, but in actual concrete things.—This is the Revisionist way of achieving co-operation without compromise, de-souling, or struggle for predominance.

OUR PLEDGE.

In the event of the Revisionists proving successful at the Elections, and securing the confidence of Congress, they undertake to carry out one of these schemes, without surrendering a single principle of the Zionist Movement.

We believe in the gradual Zionisation of the Jewish people. We do not despair because of temporary difficulties. We know that the iron law of Jewish history, the education of the new generation in the spirit of Jewish Nationalism, and joint work in practical enterprises for Palestine, must assuredly lead to more intimate association with the various elements in Jewry.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 070 668 9

JOIN THE UNION OF ZIONISTS-REVISIONISTS !

Central Office :

9, BIS RUE VINEUSE, PARIS (16).

London Office :

6, UPPER BEDFORD PLACE, LONDON, W.C.1.

Printed by I. Narodiczky, 48, Mile End Road, London, E.1